

Attorney's Docket: 2001DE408
Serial No.: 10/085,997
Art Unit: 1751

Response to Final Office Action of August 25, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed August 25, 2005 has been carefully considered together with each of the references cited therein. The amendments and remarks presented herein are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration of the present Application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended the Application to attend to housekeeping matters and to more clearly describe the invention. Claim 1 was amended to incorporate the recitation of claim 11. Claims 10 through 16 were canceled. It is believed that no new matter has been introduced by these amendments and that no additional search is required by the office.

Applicant's invention relates to the surprising discovery that certain dye fixative agents act as dye transfer inhibitors when added to a detergent and the detergent together with the dye-transfer-inhibitor dye fixative are used in washing liquor to clean colored fabrics.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/00767('WO767'); claims 1, 2, 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. (US 4,634,544) ('544'); claims 1-5 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panandiker et al. (US 6,596,678), claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/00767 as applied to claims 1-7, and 10 above, and further in view of Panandiker et al (US 6,596,678); and, Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Panandiker et al (US 6,596,678) as applied to claims 1-5 and 7-10 above, and further in view of WO 01/00767. As amended claim 1 now recites that the dye transfer inhibitor is obtained from reacting dicyanodiamine with ethylenediamine and formaldehyde and at least one component selected from a list of surfactants and other customary components; as recited in claim 11. Claim 11 was objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim. None of the references of record, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a specific dye fixative as now recited in amended claim 1. Therefore all of

Attorney's Docket: 2001DE408Serial No.: 10/085,997Art Unit: 1751Response to Final Office Action of August 25, 2005

the rejections of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of the references of record should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 2-9, as amended, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of the references of record should be withdrawn for the reasons given in support of amended claim 1, from which they depend.

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the above remarks, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn and that this application is in a condition for an allowance of all pending claims. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and an allowance of all pending claims are courteously solicited.

An early and favorable action is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Silverman
Registration No. 36,277, Agent for Applicants

(CUSTOMER NUMBER 25,255)

CLARIANT CORPORATION
INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
4000 Monroe Road, Charlotte, NC 28205
Telephone: (704) 331-7156
Facsimile: (704) 331-7707